

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Amendments to Specification and Claims

Claim 1 and page 2 of the substitute specification have been amended to specify, as shown in Figs. 1 and 2, that the incoming background light is incident on the front of the device, and that the text or patterns are displayed so as to be visible from the front of the device. This is clearly shown in Figs. 1 and 2, and is consistent with the description of the invention as replacing a “conventional display by reflection” (see, *e.g.*, page 1, lines 14-16 of the original specification). Therefore, the added material does not constitute new matter.

Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested, despite being submitted after final rejection, on the grounds that the amendments place the application clearly in condition for allowance over the art of record, or at least on the grounds that the amendments place the application in better form for appeal. It is respectfully noted that the amendments were necessitated by prior art rejections made for the first time in the final Office Action.

Finally, claim 12 has been amended to include the limitations of original claims 3 and 11, pursuant to the indication of allowable subject matter in item 5 on page 5 of the Official Action.

2. Rejection of Claims 3, 7, and 9-11 Under 35 USC §102(b) in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. JP 04-020990 (Fujiwara)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Fujiwara publication fails to disclose a light guiding arrangement of the type claimed, in which light incident on a front face of the device is used to enhance a display visible from the front of the device, as claimed. Instead, the Fujiwara publication collects light incident on a dome at the top of the device, and uses the light to energize phosphors visible from a front of the device.

The point of the present invention is that it can be used in place of a simple reflective display, such as a sign hung on a door or wall. Like the reflective display, background light is re-directed back at the viewer according to predetermined patterns to enhance the display. However, the reflections created by the display of the invention are brighter than the reflections in a conventional two-dimensional display.

Fujiwara merely uses the collected light to energize phosphors, alternately with a light bulb. This is not the same as the reflective effect of the present invention. Light concentration and guiding is of course well-known, and in fact is the basis for a variety of optical displays and communications apparatus. However, none of these devices convert background light incident on the front of the display into concentrated patterns visible by a person standing in front of the display.

Because the Fujiwara publication fails to disclose or suggest a “reflective” display as claimed, *i.e.*, one that concentrates and directs background light back in the direction of the background, it is respectfully submitted that the Fujiwara publication does not anticipate the claimed invention, and therefore that the rejection of claims 1, 3, and 7 under 35 USC §102(b) is improper and should be withdrawn.

3. Rejection of Claims 3-8 Under 35 USC §102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,297,000 (Fries)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Fries patent, like the Fujiwara publication, fails to disclose or suggest an optical conversion device that concentrates background light incident on a front of the device in order to create enhanced optical patterns for viewing from the front of the device, thereby providing an enhanced “reflective” display effect. Instead, as illustrated in Fig. 3 of the Fries patent, light collected by the optical fibers is diverted to a variety of locations, none at the front of the device.

Serial Number 09/991,961

By concentrating background light to be directed back at the viewer, the display of the claimed invention provides the illusion of enhanced reflection. Based on the intensity of the background, the viewer expects to see a certain level of reflection, but is surprised by the enhanced reflection. No such surprising, entertaining, and esthetically pleasing effect is present in a conventional light guiding arrangement of the type disclosed in Fries, in which no connection between the background and the display is apparent to the viewer.

Because the Fries patent does not disclose or suggest all features positively recited in each of the pending claims, it is respectfully submitted that the Fries patent neither anticipates the claimed invention nor renders it obvious, and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8 based on the Fries patent is respectfully requested.

4. Objection to Claim 12

Claim 12 has been re-written in independent form to include the limitations of claims 3 and 11, from which it originally depended, thereby overcoming the objection set forth in item 5 on page 5 of the Official Action.

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



Date: October 15, 2003

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB3\Producer\red\Pending Q...ZY\YAN0991961\w02.wpd